

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/747,722	12/29/2003	Axel Preusse	2000.109700	5854
23720 75	590 11/03/2004		EXAMINER	
WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C. 10333 RICHMOND, SUITE 1100			WOJCIECHOWICZ, EDWARD JOSEPH	
HOUSTON, T			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2815	
			DATE MAILED: 11/03/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commence	10/747,722	PREUSSE ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Edward Wojciechowicz	2815	Br			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addr	0SS			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the m earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N). R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be t i. I reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror atute, cause the application to become ABANDON	imely filed  sys will be considered timely.  In the mailing date of this commodities  ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	munication.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	3 August 2004.					
2a)☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)☑ -	This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice und			nerits is			
Disposition of Claims	or Exparto Quayro, 1000 0.5. 11,					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are pending in the applicat	tion					
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>19-22</u> is/are without						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	arawn nom consideration.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8,10-16 and 18</u> is/are rejected.	,					
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>9 and 17</u> is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar	nd/or election requirement.					
Application Papers		. 8				
9) The specification is objected to by the Exan	niner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the con	rrection is required if the drawing(s) is o	bjected to. See 37 CFR	l 1.121(d).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note the attached Office	e Action or form PTO	-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for force a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in Applica priority documents have been receivereau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ntion No  ved in this National St	tage			
Attachment(s)	_					
1) ⊠ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☑ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I					
2) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8-2-04</u> .	/	Patent Application (PTO-1	52)			

Application/Control Number: 10/747,722

Art Unit: 2815

#### Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of claims 1-18 in the reply filed on 8-13-04 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 19-22 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 8-13-04.

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1, 2, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee (6,784,051). The Le patent teaches the inventive process whereby the edge of a substrate is etched to remove part of a metal stack and an adjacent insulating layer from the edge of the substrate. See, for example, Fig. 4B of Lee, and the discussion at col. 6, I. 29-32.

Application/Control Number: 10/747,722

Art Unit: 2815

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-6, and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and further in view of Hara et al (6,451,696). While the Lee reference shows the basic inventive concept of the invention, it is silent as to the specific etchants used to remove the metal stack and insulating layer from the edge of the substrate. Hara shows a related process which also specifically teaches the use of the same etchants claimed in the invention. For example, at col. 6, I. 50-55, Hara discloses that diluted mixtures of nitric acid and hydrofluoric acid may typically be used in the processing of semiconductor substrates to remove not only metal layers, but also the dielectric films adjacent to the metal stack.

In addition, at col. 6, I. 34-39, Hara teaches that different etchants may be used sequentially (as recited in applicant's claims 4-6 and 16) so as to remove the unwanted layers sequentially, as claimed.

Claims 7, 10, 11 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and further in view of Hara and Hongo et al (6,615,854). While the references to Lee and Hara, discussed above, teach the inventive process for removing metal layers from the edge of a semiconductor substrate, they do not specifically mention the use of copper as one of the metals being removed. Hongo, which also teaches the removal of unwanted metals from the edge of a semiconductor wafer, specifically mentions that copper is usually one of the metals that is typically removed during this process. See, for example, Hongo's teaching at col. 2, I. 1-5. In this same recitation, Hongo teaches that the etchant may also be applied to the back side of the substrate, as recited in applicant's claims 10 and 18. In addition, Hongo's recitation at col. 1, I.56, that the copper layer is typically plated, would meet the limitation of claim 11 that the copper is formed by an electro-chemical process.

Application/Control Number: 10/747,722

Art Unit: 2815

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 9 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any

intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Edward Wojciechowicz whose telephone number is 571-272-1739. The examiner can

normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom

Thomas can be reached on (571) 272-1664. The fax phone number for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC)

at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EW: ew

DWARD WOJCIECHOWICZ

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Edward Wojciechowicz Primary Examiner Art Unit 2815 Page 4